

29 August 69

Harold:

Sight-0-Line is a columator. I could not remember the technical name for the gadget when I wrote before. I saw an article in a recent gun mag re Line-0-Sight. If you want it, tell me and I'll dig it up. Better to go to gun shop and see how it works. I believe it will give accuracy within 4 inches of zero at ~~xxx~~ 100 yards (i.e. within an 8-inch circle surrounding zero). I am not sure of that.

Slits in JFK shirt front: Some time ago I fired bullets into shirt cloth hung from a target frame (simulating exit, where there is no fleshy substance behind the cloth) and never produced slits-- just holes. I can't remember how many shots were involved-- at least 10. I have to sight-in a rifle soon and will set up another cloth and send you results. It is possible that a tumbling bullet could cause such slits, but if that were the case, JFK's front-neck wound would be much larger, ragged edges, and not circular.

Frazier's info that the fibers were pushed outward can have no bearing on direction of missile passing through shirt front (if the slits were caused by missile, which I doubt), for ~~xxx~~ JFK's clothes were roughly handled when removed from Parkland. Pictures show them rolled up into a ball as they are being carried from Parkland. Correction (after reviewing one of the pictures): they may be Connally's clothes in the picture, so ignore this. Sorry. But I still think it has no bearing on the circumstances of the shooting. The wound is the important thing.

As indicated in a previous letter, I do not doubt that Humes and the others knew there was a missile wound in the front-neck, and that Humes' calls to Perry were a charade to make it possible for them to disguise their knowledge. I wish I had noticed the evidence for this before Finck got on the stand in N.O. Garrison's lawyer could have squashed him like a grape or (to use a more familiar expression) rubbed his dick in the dirt. I suggest that you re-read my letter on this and ~~xxxxxx~~ check with a pathologist to see whether allegations there are justified. If so, put in in one of your books. The more I think of it, the more I think it is exceedingly important-- especially considering some of Finck's N.O. testimony regarding failure to dissect neck area. I have only the account in the N.O. papers, but the hedging, military orders, and the rest all fit with my notion that the autopsy doctors knew that the tracheotomy cut across a missile wound and that it was an entrance wound. Besides, Perry was on TV announcing a bullet wound in the front neck. I believe this was before the autopsy began. They must have known about this front-neck missile wound (a) from Perry's press conference and (b) from their own observation of the wound. They cannot have avoided knowing it. The calls to Perry make marvelous good sense in light of this-- the cover-up was not possible without without the calls.

The give-away is in the Autopsy Report where they say the wound was 6.5 cm long and had irregular edges. The only irregularity in the wound was the circular wound over which Perry cut. The word "irregular" is the keyhole that lets us look into their room of knowledge. Its implications are inescapable.

Remember they cut Humes' wound of the neck.

I doubt whether your pond will sustain big fish unless you provide food. Also, we may have a different idea of what constitutes big.

I hope Bantam comes through. When ready, send me the parts dealing with firearms (and any other parts you want). On technical matters you should be checked carefully, for a slip-up could be damaging. The press is willing to excuse even the inexcusable "blunders" of the honorable men in government and their hacks, but they will not tolerate error in us. Those bastards.

School starts soon and I'll be extra busy, but do not hesitate to use me in any way you want. If I can't do what you want, I'll say so, but don't hesitate because you think I am busy. Let me decide.

I have put most of my lecture on slides; the advantage is great. It's strange, but having Zapruder on film changes the whole thing. Issues always required explanation of details and some argument, but now all I have to do is dispassionately relate the WC's version, show a picture of CE 399 and then show Zapruder. It's not that simple, of course, but at least I can do what the WC never did-- let the people see the evidence and decide for themselves.

The fun comes when they make up their minds without help. I gave a talk to some gun buffs at my shooting club; it came off marvelously. Using Life pictures of Zapruder I coolly went through the single-bullet theory. As finale, I cast CE 399 on the screen simply with the words, "This is the bullet that did the damage". There was silence for a while as they waited for me to say something else. Finally somebody got the idea that I meant the bullet, and he gave a little cough. Another guy started to chuckle, and gradually it spread until the room was an uproar of laughter. It ~~has~~ never before caught fire like that, but this was an audience with special knowledge. Anyway, it was a gasser, and I loved it.

Still,

hik

BERNABEI